



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,884	07/22/2003	Richard Harkins	51791AUSCI	1667
27586	7590	01/08/2008	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO AND BRANIGAN, P.C. C/O BERLEX BIOSCIENCES 2200 CLARENDON BOUEVARD SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			BLANCHARD, DAVID J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1643		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/08/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/624,884	HARKINS ET AL.
	Examiner David J. Blanchard	Art Unit 1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 30,31,33-35 and 37-49 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 42 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 30,31,34-35, 37-41 and 43-49 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29, 32 and 36 are cancelled.
Claims 30 and 37 have been amended.
Claims 38-49 have been added.
2. Claims 30-31, 33-35 and 37-49 are pending and under consideration.
3. This Office Action contains New Grounds of Rejections.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

4. The objection to the specification at pg. 39 as containing the hyperlink www.genweb.com is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the specification.
5. The rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement as introducing new matter is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of the claim.
6. The rejection of claims 30-31 and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of detecting a disease-state in a subject associated with the expression of RG1 (SEQ ID NO:2) comprising administering an immunoconjugate comprising an antibody or antigen-binding fragment thereof that specifically binds RG1 (SEQ ID NO:2), wherein an increased level of binding in the compared to disease free control subjects is indicative of a disease state, does not reasonably provide enablement for said method of detecting a disease state in a subject comprising administering an immunoconjugate comprising an antibody variant is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims and the cancellation of claim 36.
7. The rejection of claims 30-31 and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ali et al (US 2005/0147556 A1, priority to 10/19/1998, cited on PTO-892 mailed 6/5/2006) is withdrawn in view of applicants' arguments.
8. The provisional rejection of claims 30-31 and 33-37 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-

Art Unit: 1643

36 of copending Application No. 10/895,183 is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of claims 30-36 of copending Application No. 10/895,183.

9. The rejection of claim 36 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,902 B2 is withdrawn in view of the cancellation of the claim.

Rejections Maintained and New grounds of Rejections

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. The rejection of claims 30-31, 34-35, 37 and now applied to newly added claims 38-41 and 43-49 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 9-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,902

Art Unit: 1643

B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The response filed 10/4/2007 states that this issue is not ripe and applicants' will revisit this issue at the appropriate time. Applicants' remarks are acknowledged, however instant claims 30-31, 34-35, 37-41 and 43-49 remain drawn to an invention that is patentably indistinct from the invention of claims 1-7 and 9-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,902 and the rejection is maintained.

Applicant is reminded that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned US Patent 6,682,902 B2 discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

12. Claims 33 and 42 are free of the prior art. Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Blanchard whose telephone number is (571) 272-0827. The examiner can normally be reached at Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, can be reached at (571) 272-0832.

The official fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David J. Blanchard/
Primary Examiner, A.U. 1643